IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
AT JAIPUR BENCH, JAIPUR

O R D E R

(1) S.B. CRIMINAL REVISION PETITION NO. 803/2005
SUBE SINGH Vs. STATE OF RAJASTHAN & ORS.
&
(2) S.B. CRIMINAL REVISION PETITION NO. 840/2005
LALIT KUMAR Vs. STATE OF RAJASTHAN

DATE: 21.05.2007.

HON'BLE MR. K.S. RATHORE, J.

Advocates in S.B. Crim. Rev. Pet. No. 803/2005-

Mr. Ashvin Garg for the complainant-petitioner.
Mr. B.K. Sharma, Public Prosecutor for the State.
Mr. V.S. Yadav for the accused-respondents.

Advocates in S.B. Crim. Rev. Pet. No. 840/2005-

Mr. V.S. Yadav for the accused-petitioner.
Mr. B.K. Sharma, Public Prosecutor for the State.

****

These two revision petitions are filed against the same impugned order dated 10.08.2005 passed by the Additional Sessions Judge (Fast Track), Behrod, District Alwar in Sessions Case No. 52/2004 (40/2004), one by complainant-petitioner Sube Singh, who has challenged the impugned order dated 10.08.2005 on the ground that accused-respondents Sandeep Kumar and Sunil Kumar @ Sonu are wrongly declared as juvenile on the basis of the educational certificates whereas the

medical report submitted by the Radiologist has not been considered.

Another connected revision petition bearing No. 840/2005 has been filed by accused-petitioner Lalit Kumar and on his behalf it has been urged by the learned counsel Mr. Yadav that he has not been considered as juvenile on the basis of the certificate issued by the Board of Secondary Education, Rajasthan.

I have heard rival submissions of the respective parties and carefully gone through the impugned order dated 10.08.2005 passed by the Additional Sessions Judge (Fast Track), Behrod as also the relevant record.

The Court below after holding inquiry regarding age on the basis of the evidence and the educational certificates, has arrived at a conclusion that the age of accused-respondents Sandeep Kumar and Sunil Kumar is below 18 years, therefore, they have been declared as juvenile, whereas as per the school certificate accused-petitioner Lalit Kumar is above 18 years of age, therefore, he is not juvenile.

I find no illegality or error in the impugned order dated 10.08.2005 passed by the Additional Sessions Judge (Fast Track), Behrod, District Alwar. No

interference whatsoever is required by this Court.

Consequently, both the revision petitions fail and the same are hereby dismissed.

Record be sent back forthwith.

(K.S. RATHORE),J.

/KKC/